

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 were pending in this application.

Claims 1-38 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 14, 17, 23, 26, 27, 30, 34, and 35 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 1-38 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of Claims 1-38 are respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS

The Office Action objects to Claims 16, 29, and 37 because of the formatting of the claims. The claims have been reformatted as shown above. The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the claims.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claims 4, 17, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action notes an ambiguity between Claim 3 and Claim 4 (which depended from Claim 3), between Claim 16 and Claim 17 (which depended from Claim 16), and between Claim 29 and Claim 30 (which depended from Claim 29).

The Applicants have amended Claims 4, 17, and 30 to change the dependencies of Claims 4, 17, and 30 and resolve the ambiguity noted in the Office Action. The Applicants

respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 00/46988 to Hassell et al. (“*Hassell*”). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (*Fed. Cir. 1990*)). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (*Fed. Cir. 1985*)).

Hassell recites systems and methods for generating rich content television program guides for digital television feeds. (*Page 3, Lines 9-14*). The program guide is capable of using “black areas” at the sides of an image being displayed. (*Page 4, Lines 12-23*). For example, additional content may be inserted into the black areas. (*Page 4, Lines 23-27*). As particular examples, the additional content could include a listing of other digital feeds, a preview pane, textual information, video of a highlighted item in the listing, and an advertising region for advertisements. (*Page 20, Lines 1-16*).

Hassell simply recites a system for displaying additional content in black areas of a display device. *Hassell* lacks any mention that the device receiving the digital feeds (such as a cable set-top box) is capable of identifying additional content that is related to main content. For

example, *Hassell* lacks any mention of receiving main content and identifying related content that is visually and/or conceptually related to the main content. Because of this, *Hassell* contains no mention that the device is capable of identifying a “plurality of additional multimedia documents” that are “at least one of visually related and conceptually related” to a “main multimedia document” as recited in Claims 1, 14, and 27.

Hassell does recite that digital feeds containing related content may be provided by an analog carrier to the device receiving the digital feeds. (*Page 3, Lines 21-26*). However, *Hassell* lacks any mention that the device receiving the digital feeds is capable of identifying additional content that is “visually” and/or “conceptually” related to main content.

For these reasons, *Hassell* fails to anticipate a “video processor capable of receiving a main multimedia document and a plurality of additional multimedia documents from a matching engine,” where the matching engine is capable of “identifying the plurality of additional multimedia documents that are at least one of visually related and conceptually related to the main multimedia document” as recited in Claim 1. Similarly, *Hassell* fails to anticipate a “system capable of . . . identifying a plurality of additional multimedia documents that are at least one of visually related and conceptually related to the main multimedia document” as recited in Claim 14. In addition, *Hassell* fails to anticipate “identifying a plurality of additional multimedia documents that are at least one of visually related and conceptually related to the main multimedia document” as recited in Claim 27.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejection and full allowance of Claims 1-38.

DOCKET NO. US 010025
SERIAL NO. 09/772,319
PATENT

IV. **CONCLUSION**

The Applicants respectfully assert that all pending claims in the application are in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

DOCKET NO. US 010025
SERIAL NO. 09/772,319
PATENT

SUMMARY

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at wmunck@davismunck.com.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication (including any extension of time fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: Sept. 7, 2001



William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: wmunck@davismunck.com